
Baptism – the Basis of Church Unity?

The Question of Baptism in Faith and Order

Dagmar Heller

“When baptismal unity is realized in one holy, catholic, apostolic church, a genuine Christian witness can be made to the healing and reconciling love of God. Therefore, our one baptism into Christ constitutes a call to the churches to overcome their divisions and visibly manifest their fellowship.”¹

This is a quotation from *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM), the well-known document published in 1982 after many years of study and consultation in the WCC’s Faith and Order commission. What BEM sought to do, to put it simply, was *to say together that which can be said together*. The document has been described as an example of a new literary genre, the “convergence text”. The BEM text seeks to identify convergences, points at which the different Christian traditions could come together – or at least come closer to each other. “Convergence” differs from “consensus”, which the introduction to the BEM text describes as the “experience of life and articulation of faith necessary to realize and maintain the church’s visible unity”; convergences, by contrast, are points at which it is possible to speak with one voice even if there is not yet consensus on all the details.

The BEM text deals with its three themes in the same way: first, a formulation of the convergences on a given question, then, in its “commentaries”, an indication of the divergences that remain. The document was sent to all the member churches of the WCC and to the Roman Catholic Church. The latter had been involved in producing the text by way of its official membership on the Faith and Order commission. The churches were asked to study the text and respond to several questions about whether they could “recognize in this text the faith of the church throughout the ages” and about the implications of this text for them. In other words, the churches were asked to receive the text and to draw the consequences from it – that is, to change any practices or attitudes which did not correspond with the common tradition as set forth in BEM.

● Dagmar Heller (Evangelical Church in Germany) is an executive secretary in the WCC’s Faith and Order secretariat. This essay is based on a lecture she presented at a colloquium on baptism and the communion of the churches in Chevetogne in September 1998; the original French version is published in *Irenikon*.

The responses of the churches were published and analyzed,² and since then Faith and Order has been following through on these themes in the directions indicated by the churches' responses.

An outline of what has been achieved by the BEM text and by the process of church responses regarding baptism will show that, while there has been progress, some problems remain. In what follows, I shall give an overview of the present ecumenical situation concerning baptism and the extent to which it is a basis for the communion of the churches. I shall conclude by summarizing what Faith and Order has been doing in this area recently.

Convergences on baptism

The BEM document was generally greeted with a great deal of enthusiasm and positive reaction. Above all, it was apparent that, of the three parts of the text, the highest degree of convergence has been attained regarding baptism.

The text begins by describing the agreement among different traditions regarding the institution and meaning of baptism (chs I-II). Baptism, it says, is "participation in Christ's death and resurrection", which implies conversion, pardoning and cleansing, and is the gift of the Spirit and incorporation into the body of Christ. In this sense, baptism is the sign of the kingdom of God. A commentary to Chapter II underscores the need to recover baptismal unity and observes that churches which allow differences of sex, race or social status to divide the body of Christ are contradicting the concept of baptism as incorporation into the body of Christ – a contradiction between theory and practice which seriously compromises the witness of the Christian community.

In Chapter III, BEM deals with the problem of baptism and faith. All churches agree that faith is necessary "for the reception of the salvation embodied and set forth in baptism" and that "personal commitment is necessary for responsible membership in the body of Christ" (para. 8). This chapter also emphasizes that baptism is a matter of "life-long growth into Christ" (para. 9).

Regarding baptismal practice, the subject of chapter IV, BEM notes that two practices – adult baptism and infant baptism – have developed and that neither is in contradiction with the New Testament.³ But it is evident that it is here that most of the problems regarding mutual recognition of baptism are encountered. And it is interesting to see how BEM treats these problems in the commentary following paragraph 12.

The first problem is the difference between those churches which "baptize people at any age and those who baptize only those able to make a confession of faith for themselves":

The differences between infant and believers' baptism become less sharp when it is recognized that both forms of baptism embody God's own initiative in Christ and express a response of faith made within the believing community.

Thus BEM seeks to identify a convergence between the two attitudes or practices by showing that they are in fact complementary:

The practice of infant baptism emphasizes the corporate faith and the faith which the child shares with its parents. The infant is born into a broken world and shares in its brokenness. Through baptism, the promise and claim of the gospel are laid upon the child. The personal faith of the recipient of baptism and faithful participation in the life of the church are essential for the full fruit of baptism.

The practice of believers' baptism emphasizes the explicit confession of the person who responds to the grace of God in and through the community of faith and who seeks baptism. Both forms of baptism require a similar and responsible attitude towards Christian nurture.

Furthermore, the text seeks to show how a mutual recognition could take place:

In some churches which unite both infant-baptist and believer-baptist traditions, it has been possible to regard as equivalent alternatives for entry into the church both a pattern whereby baptism in infancy is followed by later profession of faith and a pattern whereby believers' baptism follows upon a presentation and blessing in infancy. This example invites other churches to decide whether they, too, could not recognize equivalent alternatives in their reciprocal relations and in church union negotiations.

This is further elaborated in paragraph 16:

In order to overcome their differences, believer baptists and those who practise infant baptism should reconsider certain aspects of their practices. The first may seek to express more visibly the fact that children are placed under the protection of God's grace. The latter must guard themselves against the practice of apparently indiscriminate baptism and take more seriously their responsibility for the nurture of baptized children to mature commitment to Christ.

What is important to note here is that the document understands adult and infant baptism as two forms of one unique baptism, accentuating different aspects of the meaning of baptism. The authors of BEM consider mutual recognition possible if each side would in practice try to express more adequately all the aspects of baptism on which there is agreement.

A second problem BEM tries to resolve in this chapter is the question of how the gift of the Holy Spirit is expressed in the rite of baptism. The formula "all agree that Christian baptism is in water and the Holy Spirit" (para. 14) seeks to bring together the position of those Western churches which insist on a rite in which the baptized confess their faith before they are regarded as full members of the church (and in some churches one may not be admitted to the eucharist before this rite), with that of the Orthodox churches, for whom baptism (seen as inseparable from chrismation) allows for immediate communion. The basic question here is how far baptism makes the baptized a member of the church in the full sense. BEM suggests that churches which do not allow baptized children to commune should reflect about whether they have truly accepted the implications of baptism. On the other hand, or rather in the other direction, the text emphasizes that a continuing reaffirmation of baptism is necessary.

The final chapter deals with the celebration of baptism. Among other things, it mentions the liturgical elements which all traditions agree should be found in any baptismal liturgy, though it does not set out a baptismal order as such. Regarding the confusion in some parts of the world between baptism and christening, this chapter states that the emphasis in baptism should be placed on "the true Christian significance of baptism" (Comm. 21). In connection with the problem of indiscriminate infant baptism in some churches, the text suggests a more critical reflection on the meaning of baptism. Another problem mentioned briefly (and without any proposed solution) is that raised by those churches like the Kimbanguists which do not use water but practise only the baptism of the Holy Spirit with the laying on of hands, while at the same time recognizing the baptism of other churches.

In summary, BEM was able to formulate a text on baptism which expresses broad convergences on the institution and meaning of baptism. Evidence that the differences in this area are not church-dividing is seen in the fact that the BEM text includes almost no “commentaries” in these chapters. The text also sketches convergences on the theological question of the relation between baptism and faith and on the celebration of baptism. That is, in these areas it seeks to formulate what can be said together, using formulations that take account of the different traditions. Moreover, the text points to some directions in which the various churches might change in order to come closer to one another. And what is perhaps most interesting – because it would seem to be the most difficult – is the proposal the text makes for resolving the differences in practice between churches which baptize infants and those which practise believers’ baptism.

In general BEM was very optimistic about the possibility of mutual recognition of baptism:

Churches are increasingly recognizing one another’s baptism as the one baptism into Christ when Jesus Christ has been confessed as Lord by the candidate or, in the case of infant baptism, when confession has been made by the church (parents, guardians, godparents and congregation) and affirmed later by personal faith and commitment (para. 15).

Has this optimism been sustained by the official responses from the churches?

The churches’ responses

In general, there is an impressive degree of agreement and convergence towards a consensus in the responses to the baptism section of BEM, with many churches describing this as the most acceptable part of the document.

Briefly stated, convergences can be identified in the following areas:

1. Nearly all the responses applaud BEM’s solid scriptural rooting: its summary of the New Testament view of baptism in water administered in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, and of the biblical images of baptism (see para. 2).
2. The way in which the text describes the meaning of baptism.
3. Regarding what is said about the relationship between the gift of God and the human response of faith, “many reactions believe that the necessary inter-relation between divine initiative and human response as expressed in the scriptures has been maintained both in these paragraphs and throughout the entire text”.⁴
4. The responses generally approve the emphasis on the priority of God’s initiative:

The balance held in the text between God’s gracious gift and the human response of faith, the emphasis on baptism as a decisive beginning of an initiatory process, and the importance of the community of faith as the context for the individual’s act of faith and growth in faith are welcomed as appropriate bases by many for holding together the two practices of what the text calls baptism of believers and baptism of infants.⁵

5. The insertion of the faith response of the candidate within the framework of the faith of the believing community.
6. The portrayal of initiation as a process.
7. The insistence on the ethical implications of baptism.

8. The relationship between common baptism and the imperative of witness to unity.

While the convergences which BEM has identified concerning the meaning of baptism and the relationship between baptism and faith have thus been widely confirmed, it also becomes evident from reading the responses that (1) there are several problems which BEM has not really dealt with but the churches feel must be addressed, and (2) some of the problems surrounding baptism are more serious than BEM portrays them to be. On these points the divergences are still too great to allow us to speak with one voice. The most important of these points are the following:

1. The question remains open whether the rite is to be understood as *effecting* or *signifying* the elements of the Christian life into which the baptized is initiated. This is the question of the relationship between the sign and what is signified. Linked to it is the question of sacramentality. It is clear also from what was said in the Faith and Order text on *Confessing the One Faith* (1991) and by the fifth world conference on Faith and Order (1993) that there is still a difference between churches with a sacramental concept of baptism and those with a symbolic concept.⁶

2. A related area of unclarity is that of grace and the ecclesiological dimension of baptismal grace.

3. While there is some convergence regarding baptism as the beginning of a process, there is a certain lack of clarity about the relationship between baptism, chrismation, confirmation and admission to the Lord's supper. Some insist on chrismation as part of the rite of baptism, others understand chrismation as a different sacrament from baptism, while still others do not recognize chrismation but require a personal confession of faith before admission to the eucharist.

4. The greatest divergence evident in the responses concerns the question of the practice of infant baptism over against the practice of adult baptism. For example, the Baptist churches are generally "not very happy with the way in which the text holds the two baptismal practices together. The text... has too easily dismissed as fundamental incompatibility between infant and adult believer's baptism. They detect a theological difficulty in maintaining one baptism in two different forms."⁷ One Baptist church suggests that "there are still theological difficulties involved in maintaining that the church has one baptism in two different forms that are on the same level".⁸ That is, they reject BEM's proposed solution of understanding the different practices as two forms of the same baptism.

5. In this connection, it should be noted that while all churches agree that baptism cannot be repeated (BEM urges churches not to do anything that could be understood as "re-baptism"), the problem is in fact much more difficult. Those churches which do "re-baptize" (as those who baptize infants would see it) do not themselves consider this to be a "re-baptism" at all; for them it is the first and only baptism. Thus there is evidently still a difference in the understanding or definition of baptism which BEM does not discuss and which is far from being resolved. The issue here is whether or not *personal* faith is a prerequisite for baptism. All churches agree that faith is necessary, but for some this can be the faith of the church, expressed during the baptism by the parents or the godparent, while for others it is necessary for the candidate to express the faith himself or herself. This points also to the fact that the question of what is understood by "faith" is still open.

The present situation

To describe the present ecumenical situation regarding baptism we must go beyond the official responses to look at what is in fact happening among the churches. And on that basis it must be acknowledged that a certain degree of progress has been made. Under the influence of BEM some churches have come closer together or even recognized each other (for instance, the churches in the Porvoo and Meissen agreements). But it must be added that this is not the result of what BEM says on baptism: the churches which are parties to these agreements did not have problems with one another over the issue of baptism. Furthermore, a number of important problems remain for many churches in the area of the mutual recognition of baptism. These problems centre around two principal issues:

1. One area of difficulty has to do with the differences between the churches which baptize adults and those which baptize infants. As stated above, these are differences in the concept of baptism and on the question of faith. At this point, I think it must be said, BEM was a little too optimistic. Its identification of convergences here did not take sufficient account of the differences between these two sorts of churches. And today the Baptist churches in general are expressing themselves much more strongly on this question.
2. The second area of difficulty – about which there has been little discussion – concerns differences among those churches which baptize infants. In particular, the Orthodox churches still do not recognize the baptism of other churches on principle. In the words of Henry Chadwick,

the Orthodox churches of the East are deeply resistant even today about the possibility of recognizing the baptism of any Christian community which does not share the right faith, orthodoxy: baptism is initiation into the church, and no heretic can admit anyone to the church.⁹

In principle the Orthodox do baptize a person coming from another church (which from the point of view of the other church would be seen as “re-baptizing”). *In practice*, the situation is different from church to church. In the USA, for example, many Orthodox churches would not (re-)baptize a person coming from an Oriental Orthodox church, the Roman Catholic Church or from an historic Protestant church.¹⁰ To take another example, this one from Europe, the Russian Orthodox Church does not (re-)baptize Lutherans or Catholics, while the Church of Greece does.

But in any case, if the Orthodox do not (re-)baptize a person coming from another church, it is only because of what they call *oikonomia*, an exception or suspension of the strict application (*akribia*) of the canons and normative rules of the church. From the point of view of *akribia*, all non-Orthodox sacraments are invalid, but they may be valid *kat' oikonomia* – according to *oikonomia*. But this is not to attribute to them validity per se. In other words, “in theory the Orthodox church has not fully accepted the baptisms of other churches to be the baptism of the early church [which is their criterion], but in practice accepts it so that it does not baptize those coming from these churches into the Orthodox church”.¹¹

There are two reasons for this principled non-recognition of the baptism of other churches. In the first place, from the Orthodox point of view, baptism should be immediately linked with chrismation and eucharist. Here one can recognize a difference about the very concept of baptism. Second, and more important, is the fact that for the

Orthodox, a baptism – as with all the sacraments of other churches – can be recognized only if the other church can be recognized as a church in the Orthodox sense of the word,¹² that is, if unity is truly achieved. Meanwhile, there is the possibility of practising *oikonomia*, but the use of *oikonomia* is also an ecclesiological issue: one cannot simply apply it in any circumstance whatsoever. The cases in which *oikonomia* may be applied are not precisely defined, and there is a reluctance to do so before the great and holy pan-Orthodox council which is presently being prepared. Thus the practice differs widely among Orthodox churches.

As far as the Oriental (non-Chalcedonian) Orthodox churches are concerned, there is evidently a certain confusion: the Syrians, for example, rebaptize Lutherans in Syria but not in the USA. For them, baptism must be done by a priest who stands in the apostolic succession – which is the reason they do not (re-)baptize Catholics.

Baptism as a basis of unity

Most churches' responses to BEM "affirm the text's insistence that baptism is a basic bond of unity".¹³ All churches "agree that baptism is incorporation into the body of Christ". And "almost all are ready to recognize some baptisms outside their institutional boundaries as being incorporation into this body which is the church".¹⁴ It is thus evident that a certain will to unity exists and that baptism is seen as in some sense a basis for this unity. At the same time there is a contradiction between a unique baptism and the divided Christian communities.

This analysis of the responses to BEM strikes me as being more positive than the current situation warrants. My impression is that it has not taken sufficient account of the identity of the "most churches" or "almost all churches" of which it speaks. For a closer look will demonstrate that those who agree on these questions are precisely those churches which do not have problems with others on the point of recognition of baptism.

This is why I want now to look more closely at how far baptism can be a "basic bond of unity" (BEM, para. 6) for the churches. To do so, it seems to me that one must distinguish three different "types" of churches in the present situation. There are, on the one hand, churches which recognize only adult baptism and, on the other, those which accept baptism at any age. Among this second type one must distinguish those which accept any baptism, even if done outside of their own church, from those which in principle accept a baptism only if it is done in their church.

The situation between churches which practise only adult baptism and those which baptize infants is somewhat paradoxical, because unity for the Baptist churches is not so much based on baptism. If one considers eucharistic communion as the sign of unity, Baptists have no problem accepting other Christians at the Lord's table: indeed, it is the baptismal practice of the Baptists which is an obstacle to the other churches' accepting *them* at communion. Here unity will be attained only by way of a convergence on the question of faith such that the Baptists can recognize the baptism of other churches. Obviously there are different conceptions of baptism, and it is necessary to clarify in what sense faith is necessary for baptism. One must also take account here of the fact that in Baptist churches baptism is often understood more as personal conversion than as entry into the church.¹⁵ At this point, the differences between these two "types" of churches are differences in the understanding of the ecclesiological dimension of baptism.

It would seem easier to see baptism as a basic bond of unity among those churches which practise infant baptism. But here, too, as I have said, there is a distinction. As far as the unity of Orthodox churches with other churches which baptize infants is concerned, for the Orthodox a baptism in another church – even if it is recognized – is not complete, because it lacks chrismation. But what is more important is that for the Orthodox, unity in faith and the recognition of the others as “orthodox” churches is a prerequisite. And if one takes this strictly, baptism is a token of unity only after unity is restored. In other words, the differences here too centre on the ecclesiological dimension of baptism.

One way of portraying this situation is to suggest that all the churches can be placed on a spectrum according to their view of the relation between the human person and God and the role of the church in this relation. Those churches baptizing only adults tend to see the human person directly before God without an intermediary. On the other end of the spectrum are the Orthodox (and the Catholics), who tend to see the church as intermediary between the human person and God – in the sense that this relationship exists only through the church. The churches of the Reformation are then placed somewhere between these two ends of the spectrum.

To return to the Orthodox: it is necessary here also to look at their practice, as I have mentioned. That is, one must ask what it means that it is possible to apply *oikonomia* in some cases. If, for example, a church (re-)baptizes a Protestant who wishes to join it, it is very clear that this Protestant is considered as a non-Christian. But a Protestant would then want to ask: if an Orthodox church is a member of the World Council of Churches, it accepts that in a certain sense the other WCC member churches are Christian churches. How then can some Orthodox churches treat the members of these other churches as non-Christians?

But the Orthodox will be unable to answer this question until they have genuinely clarified the question of *oikonomia*,¹⁶ which now seems almost to be an arbitrary matter, differently understood and applied in different Orthodox churches. It is important, however, that this possibility of *oikonomia* exists. That means that it is possible to recognize others – in any case some others – as members of the body of Christ through their baptism. When this happens, the boundaries of the body of Christ are no longer seen as identical with the boundaries of the Orthodox church. But what might this mean for the communion of the churches?¹⁷

In order to make progress on this question, as we have said, either the Orthodox must first come to clarity among themselves, or they must find different answers within the framework of the bilateral discussions.

A special – and, I think, interesting – case is the relation between the Roman Catholic Church and other churches which baptize infants. Here baptism is a basic bond of unity – in theory at least. For the Catholic Church generally recognizes the baptism of other churches and vice-versa (with the exception noted above regarding the Orthodox). The problem here is that this recognition has different consequences. Obviously, the Catholic Church views the Orthodox church differently from the churches of the Reformation: the Orthodox are recognized as “sister churches”, whereas the Protestant churches are not. This is why the Orthodox *could in principle* be accepted at the Catholic mass if their churches permitted it,¹⁸ which is not the case for the members of the other churches. That leads the Protestants to ask: if our baptism is recognized, why can we not be accepted for holy communion? If we are bap-

tized into the same body of Christ, why are we still divided at the Lord's table? It seems to me that these questions have a certain logic even from the Catholic point of view.

To summarize, it must be said that the problem is much more complex than one would imagine solely on the basis of a reading of BEM. And it must also be noted that there is always a certain asymmetry. In all the constellations I have described there is always one side which recognizes the other. This makes things more difficult, since the other partner can easily find itself under pressure. For example, the "historic" Protestant churches recognize the baptism of the Orthodox and also that of the Baptists. The same is true for the Catholics.

In saying all this I do not mean to deny that baptism can be considered as a "basic bond of unity". But we must be realistic about the problems that exist. As far as baptism is concerned, one can claim a certain convergence on the meaning of baptism. Here is obviously a basis for unity which should be explored, above all if all churches agree that baptism is incorporation into the body of Christ. But what does this mean? What is baptism? What is the body of Christ?

The search for a common answer to these questions leads us naturally into the area of hermeneutics. While I cannot go into detail on this subject here, I would like to underscore that the responses to BEM have revealed a certain will in the churches and also a certain possibility for seeing baptism as the basis of unity. It is now necessary to build on this foundation, and this must obviously be done in different directions according to the three "types" of churches and their relations.

In this sense, it seems to me that baptism can be a basis for unity in different degrees. Between the Baptist churches and those which baptize infants the situation is complicated by the differences in the understanding of the ecclesiological aspect of baptism and therefore also of the unity of the church. There are also divergences regarding the theological concept of baptism. But there are already also Baptist churches which, influenced by ecumenical discussions, recognize the baptism of others.

Among the churches which baptize infants, it is difficult to reply to the question of how far baptism can be the basis of unity. The concept of baptism, its theological and soteriological meaning, is not a problem. But regarding its ecclesiological significance, baptism can be considered as a basis of unity in the highest degree (compared with the relations of all churches with one another) between the Catholic Church and the churches of the Reformation (including the Anglicans).

Recent discussions

The remaining problems around baptism cannot easily be resolved. But let us look at some discussions of this subject since BEM. The past few years have seen initiatives in several institutions to take up the theme of baptism again. For example, the Lutheran World Federation organized a consultation in 1996 on the question of baptism, centring on the question: "If we are united in our common understanding of baptism, why doesn't baptism have a greater ecumenical significance than it does?"¹⁹

In January 1997 in Faverges, France, Faith and Order concentrated on the first area of questions mentioned above, concerning the differences between churches which baptize adults and those which baptize infants. An effort was made at that meeting to approach the question from the liturgical angle. That is, the point of departure

was not doctrinal questions but the ritual aspect of baptism and baptism as a model of life. Following BEM, the concept of the *ordo* of the worship service, which is an important basis for the koinonia among the churches, was applied to baptism. That is, the effort was made to develop a concept of baptism not only as an event of immersion in water, but as a lifelong process which has three elements: formation in the faith, the event with water, and life in community with all its ethical implications. This model is based on scripture. The three elements are not fixed in a precise order. If the churches could agree to understand baptism in this way, the Baptist churches could recognize the baptism of those who baptize infants.

The other area, particularly Orthodox churches' difficulties with recognizing the baptism of others, has not really been taken up yet. As I said, it would seem that the Orthodox must first agree among themselves on this point. Meanwhile, Faith and Order is planning to take up the question of sacramentality, particularly with respect to baptism – and one may hope that this could offer some assistance here.

I have tried to be realistic about the ecumenical situation concerning baptism. One may get the impression that the situation today is in fact more complicated than it was before BEM. In any case, it is not as simple as BEM portrays it. But I do not wish to be pessimistic; yet it is necessary to face the difficulties as they are. On the basis of what I have described here, one might argue that the most important thing is to continue with the bilateral dialogues. Nevertheless, to a certain extent the multilateral dialogue is also necessary. In either case, what is needed above all are patience and a profound will to attain unity.

In contrast to the enthusiastic atmosphere after the publication of BEM, I think it is necessary to acknowledge that ecumenism is above all continuing in dialogue *despite* all the difficulties. Ecumenism is founded on the faith expressed in the Creed: "I believe in *one...* church". One sometimes gets the impression that we do not in fact really believe what we are saying in these words. We must increase our faith in this area in order to have the strength and the capacity to arrive at the goal.

NOTES

¹ *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Geneva, WCC, 1982, "Baptism", para 6

² The responses were published in Max Thurian, ed., *Churches Respond to BEM*, vols I-VI, WCC Geneva, 1986-88, the analysis is summarized in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990 Report on the Process and Responses*, Geneva, WCC, 1990

³ For convenience' sake I will occasionally use the common terms "infant baptism" and "adult baptism", as BEM does, although these terms are in themselves somewhat problematic

⁴ *Ibid.*, p 44

⁵ *Ibid.*, p 45

⁶ Cf Erich Goldbach, *Taufe* (Bensheimer Hefte, 79), Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996, p 149

⁷ *Ibid.*, p 46

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ Henry Chadwick, *Tradition and Exploration*, Norwich, Canterbury Press, 1994, p 13

¹⁰ Cf John Erickson, "The Problem of Sacramental Economy", in J. Erickson, ed., *The Challenge of Our Past Studies in Orthodox Canon Law and Church History*, Crestwood NY, St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991, pp 115-32

¹¹ Marja Merras, "Baptismal Recognition and the Orthodox Churches", in Michael Root and Risto Saarinen, eds, *Baptism and the Unity of the Church*, Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1998, p 144, n13

¹² Cf Damaskinos Papandreou, "Zur Anerkennung der Taufe seitens der orthodoxen Kirche", *Una Sancta*, vol 48, 1993, pp 48-53

THE ECUMENICAL REVIEW

¹³ *BEM 1982-1990*, p.51.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp.51f.

¹⁵ Cf. Merle D. Strege, ed., *Baptism and Church: A Believers' Church Vision*, Grand Rapids, Sagamore Books, 1986, p.24.

¹⁶ According to Damaskinos Papandreou, *op. cit.*

¹⁷ Cf. also J. Erickson, *op. cit.*, pp.128f.

¹⁸ Cf. *Directory for the Application of the Principles and Norms of Ecumenism*, Vatican City, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, 1993, para. 122.

¹⁹ *Baptism and the Unity of the Church*, p.1.



Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.